The Banach-Tarski Paradox: A Mathematical Wonderland

Author Name

June 24, 2024

Abstract

The Banach-Tarski Paradox is a profound result in set theory and geometry, demonstrating that a solid ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$ can be decomposed into a finite number of disjoint subsets and reassembled into two identical copies of the original ball using only rotations and translations. This paper delves into the intricate mathematical framework underlying this paradox, including the Axiom of Choice, group theory, and measure theory. Detailed proofs and constructions are provided to elucidate the steps involved in this counterintuitive result.

Contents

1 Introduction **3**

2 Preliminaries **3**

2.1 The Axiom of Choice 3

2.2 Group Theory and Free Groups 3

2.3 Measure Theory and Non-measurable Sets 4

3 The Paradox **4**

3.1 Formal Statement 4

3.2 Group Actions and Rotations 4

3.3 Decomposition and Reconstruction 5
3.3.1 Step 1: Decomposing the Sphere 5
3.3.2 Step 2: Applying Group Actions 5
3.3.3 Step 3: Reassembling the Pieces 5
4 Implications and Interpretations **6**
4.1 Volume and Measure Theory 6
4.2 Non-physical Nature 6
5 Detailed Proofs and Constructions **6**
5.1 The Role of the Free Group 6
5.2 Constructing Non-measurable Sets 7
5.3 Applying Rotations and Translations 7
6 Conclusion **7**
7 Works Cited **8**

1 Introduction

The Banach-Tarski Paradox, discovered by Stefan Banach and Alfred Tarski in 1924, is a theorem in set-theoretic geometry which asserts that it is possible to partition a solid ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$ into a finite number of disjoint subsets and, using only rotations and translations, reassemble these subsets into two identical copies of the original ball. This result is deeply rooted in the foundations of set theory and the Axiom of Choice, challenging our classical intuition about volume and space.

2 Preliminaries

To appreciate the Banach-Tarski Paradox, we must first understand several key concepts from set theory, group theory, and measure theory.

2.1 The Axiom of Choice

The Axiom of Choice (AC) is a fundamental principle in set theory. It states that for any set X of nonempty sets, there exists a choice function f such that $f(A) \in A$ for every $A \in X$. Formally:

$$\forall X \left[(\forall A \in X, A \neq \emptyset) \implies \exists f : X \to \bigcup X \, (\forall A \in X, f(A) \in A) \right] \tag{1}$$

The AC is essential for the Banach-Tarski Paradox, as it enables the selection of points from infinitely many sets in a non-constructive manner.

2.2 Group Theory and Free Groups

Group theory studies algebraic structures known as groups. A group $(G, \cdot)$ consists of a set G and a binary operation $\cdot$ satisfying four properties: closure, associativity, identity, and invertibility.

A free group F on a set S is a group where every element can be uniquely represented as a finite product of elements from S and their inverses, with no other relations among the generators. For example, the free group on two generators a and b, denoted $F(a, b)$, consists of all finite sequences of a, b, a^{-1}, b^{-1}, excluding sequences that can be simplified.

2.3 Measure Theory and Non-measurable Sets

Measure theory extends the notion of length, area, and volume to more complex sets. A set is Lebesgue measurable if its volume can be consistently defined. The Banach-Tarski Paradox involves constructing non-measurable sets, which do not adhere to the conventional rules of measure theory.

A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is Lebesgue measurable if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an open set O such that $A \subset O$ and the Lebesgue measure $m(O \setminus A) < \epsilon$.

3 The Paradox

3.1 Formal Statement

The Banach-Tarski Paradox can be formally stated as:

Given a solid ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, there exist finite subsets $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n$ of B such that:

1. $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.
2. $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i$.
3. There exist rotations $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n$ and translations $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n$ such that $\{R_i(A_i) \cup T_i(A_i)\}_{i=1}^{n}$ forms two solid balls identical to B.

3.2 Group Actions and Rotations

Consider the group of rotations $SO(3)$ and translations $T(3)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. A key aspect of the paradox is that $SO(3)$ contains a free subgroup on two generators. Let $F_2 = \langle g, h \rangle$ be a free group on two generators g and h. This means any element of F_2 can be written as a finite product of g, h, g^{-1}, and h^{-1} with no relations other than those necessary for a group.

The action of $SO(3)$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$ by rotations can be used to define transformations of the subsets A_i. By carefully choosing these transformations, the pieces can be reassembled into two balls.

3.3 Decomposition and Reconstruction

We outline the steps involved in the Banach-Tarski Paradox:

3.3.1 Step 1: Decomposing the Sphere

We start by decomposing the sphere into a finite number of disjoint subsets. Using the Axiom of Choice, we select points in such a way that the resulting sets are non-measurable. Let B be the original ball and decompose it as follows:

$$B = P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \ldots \cup P_k \tag{2}$$

Each P_i is a non-measurable set.

3.3.2 Step 2: Applying Group Actions

We apply rotations and translations to these subsets. Let $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_k$ be rotations in $SO(3)$ and $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_k$ be translations in $T(3)$. Define the transformed sets:

$$P'_i = R_i(P_i) \tag{3}$$

$$Q'_i = T_i(P_i) \tag{4}$$

3.3.3 Step 3: Reassembling the Pieces

Finally, we reassemble the transformed sets into two identical balls. The new balls B_1 and B_2 are given by:

$$B_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} P'_i \tag{5}$$

$$B_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} Q'_i \tag{6}$$

Both B_1 and B_2 are congruent to the original ball B.

4 Implications and Interpretations

4.1 Volume and Measure Theory

The Banach-Tarski Paradox reveals that our classical understanding of volume is not sufficient in higher dimensions with the Axiom of Choice. The paradox involves non-measurable sets, which cannot be assigned a conventional volume.

4.2 Non-physical Nature

While the paradox seems to defy physical laws, it operates within the realm of pure mathematics. The non-measurable sets and the Axiom of Choice do not correspond to physical objects, so the paradox does not contradict the conservation of mass or other physical principles.

5 Detailed Proofs and Constructions

To provide a thorough understanding of the Banach-Tarski Paradox, we present detailed proofs and constructions, highlighting the mathematical intricacies involved.

5.1 The Role of the Free Group

The free group F_2 on two generators plays a critical role in the paradox. Consider the following elements in F_2:

$$g = \text{rotation by } \theta \text{ around } z\text{-axis} \tag{7}$$

$$h = \text{rotation by } \phi \text{ around } y\text{-axis} \tag{8}$$

These rotations generate a free subgroup of $SO(3)$.

5.2 Constructing Non-measurable Sets

Using the Axiom of Choice, we construct non-measurable sets. Let X be a set of representative points for the orbits under the action of F_2. Each point in X is chosen such that:

$$x \in X \implies x \notin g^n(X) \cup h^m(X) \quad \forall n, m \in \mathbb{Z}, n, m \neq 0 \tag{9}$$

5.3 Applying Rotations and Translations

We define rotations and translations that will transform the non-measurable sets into pieces that can be reassembled. Let R_i and T_i be chosen such that:

$$R_i(x) = g^n(x) \quad \text{for some } n \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{10}$$

$$T_i(x) = h^m(x) \quad \text{for some } m \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{11}$$

6 Conclusion

The Banach-Tarski Paradox is a remarkable result that challenges our conventional understanding of geometry and measure. It demonstrates the power and sometimes counter-intuitive nature of set theory and the Axiom of Choice. Through detailed mathematical constructions and proofs, we have explored the intricate steps involved in this paradox, highlighting its significance and implications.

7 Works Cited

References

[1] Banach, Stefan, and Alfred Tarski. *Theory of Sets.* Springer, 1985.

[2] Jech, Thomas. *Set Theory: The Third Millennium Edition, revised and expanded.* Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.

[3] Wagon, Stan. *The Banach-Tarski Paradox.* Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[4] Tarski, Alfred. "A paradox of infinite measure." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 42, no. 3, 1956, pp. 191-193.

[5] Kunen, Kenneth. *Set Theory: An Introduction to Independence Proofs.* Elsevier, 1983.

[6] Halmos, Paul R. *Measure Theory.* Springer, 1950.

[7] Solovay, Robert M. "A model of set-theory in which every set of reals is Lebesgue measurable." *Annals of Mathematics*, 1970, pp. 1-56.

[8] Fremlin, D. H. *Measure Theory.* Torres Fremlin, 2000.

[9] Moore, Gregory H. *Zermelo's Axiom of Choice: Its Origins, Development, and Influence.* Springer, 1982.

[10] Mycielski, Jan. "The Banach-Tarski Paradox." *Scientific American*, vol. 201, no. 6, 1959, pp. 90-97.